

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- November 16, 1966

Appeal No. 9018 "G" Street Associates, Ltd. Partnership, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on March 28, 1967.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER - April 19, 1967

ORDERED:

That the appeal for permission to erect office building with roof structures in accordance with the provisions of Section 3308 at 1325 G Street, NW., lot 79, square 252, be granted.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

- (1) Appellant's property is located in a C-4 District.
 - (2) The appeal was amended to include a request for a variance from the 0.25 limitation on the FAR of the roof structures.
 - (3) It is proposed to erect a ten (10) story office building (including stores and garage) with roof structures to house mechanical equipment, elevator equipment and stairs to penthouse.
 - (4) The total area of appellant's lot is 33,341 square feet and the area of the proposed building will be 30,141 square feet.
 - (5) The FAR of the building is 8.5.
 - (6) The area of the roof structure is 8,335 square feet and the FAR of the roof structure is 0.46.
 - (7) The material and color of the street facade of the building will be precast concrete and marble (off-white in color) and of the roof structure will be precast concrete and masonry (off-white in color).
-

(8) The excessive FAR in the roof structure is required because of the difference in height of the various pieces of mechanical equipment utilized for the heating and air conditioning. All of this equipment cannot be located on one level of the roof structure, therefore two levels are needed.

(9) This appeal was filed and heard under plans by Weihe, Black and Kerr, architects, drawings No. A-11, A-12, A-13, A-14, and A-15, approved as noted by Mr. Arthur P. Davis, member of the Board, on March 1, 1967.

(10) No opposition to the granting of this appeal was registered at the public hearing.

OPINION:

The Board is of the opinion that the granting of this appeal is in harmony with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Regulations and will not adversely affect the use of nearby and adjoining property. We are also of the opinion that appellant has shown a hardship within the meaning of the Zoning Regulations sufficient to permit the requested excess in roof structure FAR. The requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without impairing the purpose or integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

The Board concludes that the roof structures will harmonize with the street frontage of the building in architectural character, material and color and is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Regulations.